



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY.

VOL. II.

No. 5.

I.—VERRIUS FLACCUS.

II.

In the following essay I wish to consider some points connected with the fortunes of the *De Verborum Significatu* in the first five centuries of the Christian era. The main question which I would raise is whether the philological writers of those centuries have preserved fragments of Verrius other than those which have survived in the epitomes of Festus and Paulus.

I observed in my preceding essay that the work of Verrius was the first great encyclopaedia, alphabetically arranged, that was known in Roman literature. That it should be largely consulted by the scholars and antiquarians of the first and second centuries is only what we should expect, and there is evidence enough that this was the fact. Let us first take two celebrated scholars of the first century, Quintilian and Pliny the Elder. Quintilian was not a professed philologist, but he sometimes has occasion to touch lightly on questions of etymology and antique expression. In his first book (4, § 13) he alludes to such archaisms as *Valesii*, *Fusii*, for *Valerii* and *Furii*, *mertare* for *mersare*, *faedos* for *haedos*, *duellum* for *bellum*, *stlocus* for *locus*. Now it can hardly be an accident that every one of these words is to be found in Festus or Paulus. *Val-esius* and *Fusius* are discussed in Paulus p. 33, *mertare* pp. 81 and 124, *faedos* p. 84, *duellum* p. 66, *stlocus* p. 313. A little further on, in § 25, Quintilian touches on the origin of some of the most

familiar among the Roman *cognomina*, such as *Rufus*, *Sulla*, *Burrus*, *Galba*. Without wearying my readers by quoting the list in full, I may mention that out of eighteen names, seven, *Rufus*, *Burrus*, *Plautus*, *Opiter*, *Cordus*, *Postumus*, *Marcipor*, are to be found explained in the epitomes of Paulus and Festus, while two others, *Agrippa* and *Vopiscus*, are mentioned in Pliny (H. N. 7, 47), and in the last book of Nonius, whose work *De Compendiosa Doctrina* was, in its more strictly lexicographical portions, largely drawn, directly or indirectly, from Verrius Flaccus, as I shall hope to show further on.¹

But we have not yet done with Quintilian. In the sixth chapter of his first book he protests against the use of certain archaisms, to wit, *topper*, *antigerio*, *exanclare*, and *prosapia*. These words are all to be found in Festus, and so again are some others mentioned by Quintilian in the same chapter, *pacunt*, *lupus femina*, and the names *Italia*, *Beneventum*, and *Quirinalis*. In the fifth chapter (§§ 8, 13) Quintilian mentions a word *ploxenum*, which he says Catullus picked up somewhere in the neighborhood of the Po. Now Festus p. 230 has a gloss on this word which he illustrates by a line of Catullus, "gingivas vero ploxeni habet veteris." The inference readily suggests itself, when the other passages to which I have alluded are considered, that Quintilian took his remark from Verrius Flaccus, or possibly from some book of extracts from him.

I pass on now to a passage in the eighth book of Quintilian (3, § 25) where the same phenomenon recurs. Quintilian is here noticing some antiquarian expressions used by Vergil, *olli*, *quianam* and *porricere* (if this be the true reading). On these words again we find notes in Festus and Paulus; "*ollic*, *illic*," p. 196; *quianam*, p. 257; *porricere* p. 218. Besides these Quintilian has something to say of some other words, *quaeso*, *oppido*, and *autumo*. Notes on *quaeso* and *oppido* will be found in Festus (p. 259 and 184); upon *autumo* I must be allowed to pause for a moment. "*Autumo*," says Quintilian, "*tragicum est*." Now it so happens that in Festus and Paulus there is no note on this word. But Nonius p. 237 has one in which he illustrates it by a quotation from Lucilius, another from Plautus, and three from Pacuvius. Now Pacuvius was the writer who was above all others the representative of the old Roman tragedy. I think it therefore highly probable that Quintilian had before him some handbook in which *autumo* was

¹ Lists of *cognomina* may have been taken from the book of Cornelius Epicadus *De Cognominibus*; Charisius p. 110 Keil.

illustrated from Pacuvius, as it is in Nonius; and if I succeed in rendering it probable that Nonius borrowed largely from Verrius Flaccus, it may perhaps be allowable to conjecture that Verrius had some note of the kind. In the same chapter § 31 Quintilian remarks on the word *expectoro*, which is quoted by Paulus p. 80.

Let us now turn to the elder Pliny, who in his Natural History several times quotes Verrius Flaccus as an authority upon remarkable phenomena of nature. Pliny is here probably using, not the *De Verborum Significatu*, but the work of Verrius entitled *rerum memoria dignarum*. But Pliny also wrote a grammatical treatise *de dubio sermone*, of which portions are quoted by Julius Romanus, a scholar who (if we may trust the evidence collected by Keil in his preface to Charisius and Diomedes) seems to have flourished about the beginning of the second century A. D. Verrius Flaccus did not write a special treatise upon grammar; but I have endeavored to show in the preceding essay that there was a great deal of grammatical matter in the *De Verborum Significatu*. That Pliny actually consulted this work can be shown by express quotations preserved by Julius Romanus,¹ and there are other indications of the same fact. The note on *ancipes*, for instance, in Charisius p. 120 (Keil) reminds the reader very much of the note in Paulus on *anceps* p. 19; that on *aeribus* from *aes* on the same page is illustrated by a passage of Cato, and it is remarkable that on the twenty-seventh page of Festus there is also a note on the same word illustrated from Cato.

There is another point on which I wish to remark in connection with the quotations from Julius Romanus which Charisius has preserved. It is that in some cases they are arranged on the principle which we have already observed as underlying the order of words in Verrius Flaccus. Words from the same authors are quoted in separate series. This is notably the case with the alphabetical list of adverbs cited from Julius Romanus by Charisius p. 194-224; a fact which suggests the inference that it was taken from some work of a lexicographical character already arranged upon this plan. So it is with the catalogue of interjections, likewise from Julius Romanus, given by Charisius p. 239, only that this is not alphabetical. It may further be observed that the range of authors

¹ Charis. p. 126, "Verrius Flaccus"; inquit Plinius, "eorum nominum quae -us finiuntur casu nominativo ablativus in e dirigendus est." p. 141 "*panium* Caesar de analogia libro II dici debere ait. Sed Verrius contra." This note, like the one preceding and following it, probably comes from Pliny.

quoted corresponds in the main with that of the *De Verborum Significatu*.

The name of Pliny occurs frequently in the remarks of Julius Romanus upon anomaly in declension (Charisius p. 120 foll.). In these too, as in his catalogue of conjunctions, Romanus several times mentions Flavius Caper, a scholar of the age of Trajan. Whether he himself consulted authorities older than Caper or Pliny cannot be ascertained with certainty; but it may be taken as almost certain that Pliny, at any rate, drew largely on the stores of information collected by Verrius Flaccus.

Verrius Flaccus is again often quoted by Velius Longus, another scholar of the age of Trajan. But it may be that Velius Longus, writing as he did on orthography merely, is quoting not the *De Verborum Significatu*, but the *De Orthographia* of Verrius.

An encyclopaedic work containing a collection of miscellaneous information partly on natural philosophy, partly on the history, antiquities, and public and private life of the Romans, was compiled by Suetonius. Of Suetonius' *Pratum* (for thus it was entitled by its author) there is good reason for supposing that much has been preserved by Isidore. The scope of the work was different from that of the *De Verborum Significatu* of Verrius, though there were many points where the two would coincide; and it would be rash to assert that Suetonius made any very extensive use of the work of Verrius, when he might have easily taken his materials directly from Varro. But later in the second century, if I am not mistaken, Aulus Gellius studied Verrius Flaccus a great deal; indeed he has, as I remarked in my previous paper, preserved parts of the *De Verborum Significatu* which have disappeared from our epitomes.

If it be true that Festus lived in the age of the Antonines, this fact alone would show that a great deal of attention was paid to Verrius Flaccus at that epoch. The need for an abridgment of the *De Verborum Significatu* would not otherwise have arisen. The revived interest in old Latin, which reached its highest pitch in the age of the Antonines, would make the study of Verrius indispensable to literary men. And so, although the name of Verrius is not by any means always mentioned, we find a great many traces of his learning in Gellius. I have at present noticed the following, and there may be many more. Gellius 1, 16, 1 has a note on the phrase *mille hominum*, which he illustrates from Claudius Quadrigarius, Lucilius, Varro, Cato, and Cicero. Festus p. 153

preserves the words "*mille singulariter dicebant*"; comp. also p. 158. Gellius 2, 6, 5 says "*taxare pressius crebriusque est quam tangere*." There is a note on *taxare* in Festus p. 356. In the same chapter of Gellius (§ 21) we may compare the remarks on *squalere* with those in Festus p. 328. Gellius 2, 10 has a long note on the word *favisae*, which I suspect is drawn from one abridged on the 88th page of Paulus. In Gellius 2, 21, 6 there are some observations on the word *triones* which remind us of the note in Festus p. 339. Gellius 3, 18, 1 *pedarii senatores* = Festus p. 210. Gellius 4, 3, 3 *agnus femina* = Festus p. 286. In Gellius 5, 6 there is a discussion of the different kinds of crowns awarded by the Romans, which contains a great deal of matter taken from Verrius Flaccus: see Festus pp. 367, 191, 42, 195, 144. So it is with the note on *Veiovis*, *vesculus*, and their cognates in Gellius 5, 12, 1: compare Festus p. 379. The note on *dies atri* and *nefasti* in Gellius 5, 17 is avowedly taken from the fourth book of Verrius' work, although it has not survived in our epitomes; and the case is precisely the same with the observations on *historia* and *annales* in the next chapter. In chapter 21 of the same book we find the word *compluriens* defended by the authority of Cato; and it is illustrated from Cato in Paulus p. 59. In Gellius 10, 15 the interpretation of *classis procincta* reminds us of the similar words in Paulus p. 56, and the quotation from Varro at the end of the chapter recalls the note on *albus galerus* in Paulus p. 10. In the note on *temetum* Gellius 10, 23, 1 = Festus p. 364: on *ovis* masculine Gellius 11, 1, 4 = Festus p. 286; on *bovinator* Gellius 11, 7, 7 = Paulus p. 30; on *per lancem liciumque* Gellius 11, 18, 9 = Festus p. 117; on *lictor* Gellius 12, 3 = Festus p. 115; on *intra*, *citra*, and *ultra* Gellius 12, 13, 7 = Paulus pp. 42, 379; on *suculae* Gellius 12, 9 = Festus p. 301; on *bellaria* Gellius 13, 11, 7 may perhaps correspond with Paulus p. 35; on *frons* masculine Gellius 15, 9 = Festus p. 286. The definition of *atrium* given by Gellius 16, 5, 2 is the same as that in Festus p. 13, and the note on *vescus* in the same chapter is illustrated by the same passage from Lucretius in Paulus p. 368. Traces of the note given by Gellius 16, 6 on *bidens* are to be found in Paulus pp. 33 and 35. Three of the words explained in the next chapter, *botulus*, *arillator*, and *cutis*, are explained also in Paulus pp. 35, 20, and 51. The notes on *adsiduus*, *sanates*, *vas*, *talio*, *proletarius* given in Gellius 16, 10 are in Paulus pp. 9, 321, 348, 377, 363, 226, 117. Those on *alucinari* and *fenerator* in Gellius 16, 12 = Paulus pp. 24, 100, 75,

86, 94. Gellius' comment on *municipes* (16, 13, 6) is part of a fuller one preserved by Festus p. 127. The next note, on *festinare*, is avowedly from Verrius Flaccus, and part of it still remains in Festus p. 234. Gellius 16, 17 on *Vaticanus* = Festus p. 379; 17, 6 on *servus recepticius* = Festus p. 282, the source being here acknowledged. The remarks on *inseco* in Gellius 18, 9, 2 stand in close relation to those in Festus pp. 111 and 337; Gellius 19, 13 on *nonus* = Festus p. 176; and the list might doubtless be lengthened by other instances.

It may be, of course, that Gellius in these instances is only quoting independently from the same sources as Verrius Flaccus. But I cannot help suspecting that, at least in the majority of instances, he borrowed a great deal at second hand either from Verrius himself or from writers who had made extracts from him, as Probus in his "*Silva Observationum sermonis antiqui*" and Caesellius Vindex in his "*Lectiones Antiquae*" must undoubtedly have done. One must be careful, in dealing with a writer like Gellius, not to take too seriously his professions of independent research. His statements must be tested by the evidence of other facts; and there are, I think, in this case other facts which point to the conclusion that his debt, direct or indirect, to Verrius Flaccus is, to say the least, much more considerable than he himself acknowledges. Some indications of the nature of his proceedings will, I hope, be afforded by an examination of the relation of Nonius to Verrius Flaccus. I shall endeavor to show that the numerous coincidences between Gellius and Nonius are due to the fact of both writers having independently used the same authorities; that Nonius in the lexicographical parts of his work constantly copies Verrius; and that the points of agreement between Nonius and Gellius may often be explained by supposing that Gellius copies him likewise.

Carlyle has said that there must be somewhere, if only we could discover him, a greatest fool in the world. In the world of scholars Nonius has generally been regarded as playing this entertaining part. Let us deal kindly with one who was willing to make so great a sacrifice. It is not necessary to go again over the long catalogue of Nonius' transgressions against the rules of sense and sound learning. Nor am I sure that a fair judgment would pronounce the work of Nonius to fall much below the standard which an African of the third century A. D. might be expected to attain. Even Julius Romanus, in the second century, was, if we may judge

by his lists of conjunctions and interjections preserved by Charisius, fully as ignorant and careless as Nonius. The productions of such writers are valuable only for what they preserve of the work of older authors. It is a matter of the utmost importance to ascertain, if possible, what were the sources from which Nonius drew the materials for his lucubrations.

The theory which finds most favor among recent scholars (Hertz, Schmidt, Schottmüller, and Riese) is that Nonius copied largely from Gellius, and that the remaining or non-Gellian part of his book is patchwork made up out of commentaries on the writers whom he quotes. The arguments for this position are mainly two; first, that there are many remarkable, nay, almost verbal, coincidences between Gellius and Nonius, and even that the order of those passages in Nonius follows the order of the books in Gellius; secondly, that Nonius throughout all his work observes the method of quotation by series of authors, as we have seen was the case with Verrius Flaccus. This fact, it is contended, points obviously to the conclusion that where Nonius is not borrowing from Gellius, he must have made extracts from single commentaries in succession.

I would observe, first, that whether Nonius studied commentaries independently or not, there can be little doubt that in those parts of his work which can be classed as lexicographical or antiquarian, his debt, direct or indirect, to Verrius Flaccus¹ is considerable. The lexicographical parts of the *De Compendiosa Doctrina* are Books I (De Verborum Proprietate), II (De Honestis et nove Veterum Dictis), IV (De Varia Significatione Sermonum), V (De Differentia Similium Significationum), VI (De Impropriis), and much of XII (De Doctorum Indagine). In the first book I have ascertained that about a third of the glosses are identical, or nearly so, with glosses in Paulus or Festus. In the second book the proportion is much smaller, but in this some 140 notes may in like manner be traced to Verrius Flaccus. In the fourth, fifth, and sixth books the number of coincidences with Paulus or Festus dwindles very much; in the twelfth book the proportion is larger. By the antiquarian portions of Nonius I mean Books XIII (De genere Navigiorum), XIV (De genere Vestimentorum), XV (De genere vasorum vel poculorum), XVI, now lost, (De genere calciamentorum), XVII (De colore vestimentorum), XVIII (De genere

¹ That the works of Verrius Flaccus were known in some form in Africa at the end of the third century A. D. is shown by Arnobius I, 59, "quamvis Caesellios, Epicados (?), Verrios teneatis omnes et Nisos."

ciborum et potuum), XIX (De genere armorum), XX (De Propinquitate). In the eighteenth book a third, in the nineteenth half of the glosses may be traced to Verrius Flaccus. In the rest of these books and in the grammatical portions of the work (Books III, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, and part of XII) the proportion of these coincidences is much smaller; but I think I am justified in saying that about one-seventh of all the notes in Nonius stands in close relation to glosses in Paulus or Festus.

I am not sure that this fact has been noticed as it deserves by the scholars who have recently discussed the question. Passing over for the moment any inferences which it suggests as to the sources of Nonius' work, I may observe that it is of immense importance as enabling us, in many cases, to reconstruct, at least in part, the mutilated glosses of Verrius Flaccus. Let me offer a few instances in illustration of my meaning. Paulus p. 18 has the following note: "*atroces* appellantur ex Graeco, quia illi ἄτρωκτα vocant quae cruda sunt." Nonius p. 76 says "*atrox*, crudum: Naevius Belli Punici lib. III, simul atrocia porricerent extra ministratores." Here it would appear that we have two fragments of the same gloss, one giving an etymology of *atrox* from ἄτρωκτος, the other illustrating the word from Naevius. Paulus p. 118 "*latrones* eos antiqui dicebant qui conducti militabant, ἀπὸ τῆς λατρειας." Nonius p. 134 "*latrocinari*, militare mercede." He illustrates from Plautus and Ennius, the words of the latter being "fortunisque suas coepere *latrones* Inter se memorare." Again we have two fragments of one gloss, which originally included instances both of *latrones* and of *latrocinari*. Paulus p. 369 "*velitatio* dicta est ultro citroque probrorum obiectatio, ab exemplo velitaris pugnae. Plautus; Nescio quid *velitati* estis inter vos." Nonius p. 3 "*velitatio* dicitur levis contentio, dicta ex congressione velitum." Nonius illustrates by two passages from Plautus, one of which is the same as that quoted in Paulus, as well as from Turpilius, Afranius, and Caecilius. Festus p. 364 "*temetum* vinum. Plautus in Aulularia: Cererine, Strobile, has [sunt] facturum nuptias? Qui? Quia temeti nil adlatum intellego." *Temetum* and *temulentus* are then illustrated from Novius and Afranius. Nonius p. 5, "*temulenta* est ebriosa, dicta a *temeto*, quod est vinum, quod attentet." He illustrates the word by the same passage from the Aulularia, another from the Truculentus, and more from Cicero and Varro.

My contention is that in these instances, and numbers of others

which I could quote did space permit, a comparison between Nonius and Paulus enables us to recover large parts of the original glosses of Verrius Flaccus. But besides coincidences in detail, there are two general points of resemblance between the works of Nonius and of Verrius Flaccus which should not be overlooked. One is (and this is very important) that the range of authors quoted by these two writers is in the main the same, though Nonius lived some two hundred and fifty years after Verrius. Verrius naturally stops at the Augustan age, and so, with a very few exceptions, does Nonius. The exceptions too are such as almost to prove the rule. One of them is a citation from Apuleius, and the others are from Septimius Serenus, both Africans, and both almost pedantic students of antiquity. None of the other citations in Nonius are from authors later than the Augustan age. Whatever, therefore, may have been the sources of his work, the writers whom he quotes are in the main the same as those from whom Verrius draws his illustrations.

Another point of correspondence between Nonius and Verrius is their method of quotation by series of authors. On this I have perhaps said enough already; but I would observe here that the fact may be used quite as easily to show that Nonius drew upon Verrius, or upon extracts from his book, as that he used isolated commentaries. And what if it can be shown that the very series in Nonius and Verrius sometimes coincide? Paulus p. 61 has a note in a Plautine series on *capulum*, and so Nonius p. 4. In Paulus p. 96 *gestio* is apparently quoted in a series of words from Terence; it is illustrated from Terence in Nonius p. 32. Nonius pp. 85 and 86 comments on the words *coquitare* and *agnus curio*, heading both his lists of instances with a quotation from Plautus; now these words occur also in a Plautine series in Paulus pp. 60 and 61. So with the very first word on which Nonius has a note, *senium*, which is illustrated from Caecilius both by Nonius and by Festus p. 339, a page on which there are distinct traces of a series of words illustrated from Caecilius.

Supposing Nonius, then, to have been making extracts from series of authors, he might as easily, indeed more easily, have taken them from Verrius or from some abridgment of Verrius, in which he would find them manufactured ready to his hand, as from individual commentators.

But indeed the more one studies Nonius, the more clearly will it, I think, appear that his work *De Compendiosa Doctrina* is a series

of extracts not from commentaries, but from works of reference. Much of the lexicographical part comes, as we have seen, from Verrius Flaccus; much of the grammatical part can, by a comparison of parallel passages in Charisius, Diomedes, and Priscian, be shown to be derived from Pliny and Probus; and I suspect that much of the antiquarian part is from the same sources as the corresponding portions of Isidore, the *Pratum* of Suetonius being, not improbably, one of the most important of them. These conclusions, to which I have been led by an independent study of the evidence, I hope one day to substantiate in detail in a separate essay.

But, it will be said, "It may be conceded that Nonius took large parts of his work not from original commentaries, but from abridgments of lexicons and books on grammar; are you however prepared to deny that he borrowed largely from Aulus Gellius?" That he did so has been argued at length in an elaborate treatise by Martin Hertz (Jahrb. 85, pp. 706-726; 779-797), whose theory, so far as I know, has been accepted by recent scholars as one of the bases of all further investigation. And yet I hope to make it probable that Nonius did not borrow from Gellius at all; nay, that there is nothing to show that he had ever read Gellius.

(1) I have made a list, partly with the valuable aid of Hertz's dissertation, of passages common to Nonius and Gellius. Now it cannot be denied that the coincidences of all kinds are very striking; and that very often appearances are in favor of supposing that Nonius is, in a blundering way, abridging Gellius. But it not seldom happens that Nonius gives illustrations which are not to be found in Gellius. This is the case with the notes on *putus*, Gellius 7, 5, Nonius p. 27; *privus* Gellius 10, 20, 4, Nonius p. 35; *fur* Gellius 1, 18, 4, Nonius p. 50; *venti* Gellius 2, 22, Nonius p. 50; *laevus* Gellius 5, 12, 13, Nonius p. 51; *vestibulum* Gellius 16, 5, Nonius p. 53; *recepticius servus* Gellius 17, 6, Nonius p. 54; *arcera* Gellius 20, 1, 29, Nonius p. 55; *proletarii* Gellius 16, 10, Nonius p. 67; *copiari* Gellius 17, 2, 9, Nonius p. 87; *compluriens* Gellius 5, 21, 17, Nonius p. 87; *cis* Gellius 12, 13, 7, Nonius p. 92; *duodevicesimo* Gellius 5, 4, 4, Nonius p. 100; *fruniscor* Gellius 17, 2, 5, Nonius p. 113; *priores* Gellius 10, 20, 4, Nonius p. 159; *profligo* Gellius 15, 5, Nonius p. 160, and I could quote others. This fact alone constitutes a very strong argument in favor of the independence of the two writers, for what likelihood is there that a book-maker of the stamp of Nonius would add anything from his own resources?

(2) But there is a negative argument of almost equal weight. While, on the one hand, Nonius often adds instances to those in Gellius, or gives different ones, he often, on the other hand, shows a neglect or ignorance of Gellius which is quite extraordinary supposing him to have paid any serious attention to the *Noctes Atticae*. In many cases where the two writers are treating of the same words Nonius totally disregards what Gellius has said, though nothing would have been more natural than that he should have abridged it, had the work of Gellius been before him. Sometimes again he omits words which must certainly have suggested themselves to him, had he been consulting Gellius to any considerable extent.

(3) As Hertz himself observes, Nonius only appears to have used Gellius to any great extent in his first two books. Now supposing him really to have borrowed directly from Gellius, this fact is very remarkable; for there is no reason, in the nature of the case, why he should not have borrowed from him in his later books as well as in the first two. There are, it is true, nineteen if not twenty books of Nonius, each with a different title; but the contents of many of them are so similar that the whole work might as well have been divided into half the number. The phenomenon noticed by Hertz is however completely explained when we remember two facts: first, that it is in the first two books of Nonius that we find most of the coincidences between him and Verrius Flaccus; secondly, that a number of glosses common to Nonius and Gellius are also common to both writers and to Verrius Flaccus. We should be justified, from the combined similarity and dissimilarity between the Nonian and Gellian glosses, in inferring that the two writers drew upon common sources. But we can go further, and point out in a great number of cases what the common source was.

(4) There is another argument adduced in favor of the dependence of Nonius upon Gellius which I must notice before leaving this part of the subject. It is urged that the order of the notes which Nonius borrowed from Gellius follows, in Nonius, the order of the books of Gellius. This is undoubtedly true in the main, but not without exceptions. Sometimes we have a reverse order; in the second book, for instance, under the letter *P*, Nonius goes back from the sixteenth to the fifteenth book of Gellius, under the letter *S* from the ninth to the fourth, from the fourth to the third, and from the eighteenth to the ninth. And even though Nonius does on the whole follow the order of the books of Gellius, he

leaves such large gaps in doing so that not much can fairly be made of the fact; in his first book, for example, he goes from Gellius II to IV, V to IX, X to XII, XIII to XVI, XVII to XX; in his second from XI to XVI, VI to XII and XVII, V to XVII, XVII to XIX, X to XV, XV to XVIII; II to IX, IX to XVII; VI to IX, IX to XVII, XVII to XIX; IX to XVIII; VI to IX, IX to XVI; III to IX, IX to XVIII; X to XII, XII to XVI. It may be added that six books of Gellius, the first, seventh, eighth, eleventh, thirteenth, and twentieth, are not quoted at all in the first two books of Nonius.

I have now, I hope, succeeded in making it probable that there is no relation of dependence between Nonius and Gellius, and that a community of source or sources is at the bottom of their coincidences. But before leaving Nonius a word or two must be said on the relation between his work and parts of the grammatical treatise of Julius Romanus preserved by Charisius. It should be observed that the list of adverbs quoted from Romanus by Charisius p. 195 foll. stands in the same relation to Nonius as that in which we have seen that Gellius does. The note on *ampliter* occurs in Nonius p. 54 in a much fuller form. With that on *confidenter* compare Nonius p. 262 s. v. *confidentia*; on *duriter* Nonius p. 512 is much fuller than Julius Romanus, whose instances he gives with others; on *efflictim* Nonius p. 104 is again fuller, and gives different instances; *firmiter* is mentioned without examples by Julius Romanus, but by Nonius p. 512 illustrated from Lucilius, Afranius, and Cicero. With the notes on *inimiciter* compare Nonius p. 514, where the word is illustrated from Accius; with that on *impendia* Nonius p. 128; on *longe* Nonius p. 339; on *luci* Nonius p. 210; on *longum* Nonius p. 338; on *longiter* Nonius p. 515, where the same passage from Lucretius is cited; on *mordicus* Nonius p. 139; on *modice* Nonius p. 342; on *protinus* Nonius p. 376, where the note is given in a much fuller form, and is illustrated by the same passage from Vergil; on *perplexim* Nonius p. 515, where the same line of Plautus is quoted; on *publicitus* Nonius p. 513; on *pedetemptim* Nonius p. 29; on *posterius* Nonius p. 375; on *primo pedatu* Nonius p. 64; on *rarenter* Nonius pp. 164, 515; on *statim* Nonius p. 393; on *tuatim* Nonius p. 179; on *tractim* Nonius p. 178; on *testatim* Nonius p. 178; on *vespera* Nonius p. 231; on *viritim* Nonius p. 43.

I cannot but think that these coincidences are due to the fact that Nonius and Julius Romanus were drawing upon the same source

or sources. And there is an obvious general similarity between the two writers. Each quotes both in alphabetical order and also by series of authors; each has repetitions of the same word merely because it is illustrated from different writers; each makes his extracts in a shambling and helpless manner. Finally, there are indications that, like Nonius, Julius Romanus is in several instances indebted, directly or indirectly, to Verrius Flaccus. This is the case with his notes on *edius fidius*, *examussim*, *fabre*, *in mundo*, *ilico*, *ibidem*, *nauci*, *noctu*, *nudius tertius*, *neutiquam*, *oppido*, *subinde*, *secus*, *sarte*, *viritim*; and some of these are common also to Nonius and Festus. I have therefore little doubt that there was much of Verrius' work embedded in the writings from which Romanus and Nonius made their extracts.

Let us now proceed to consider for a moment the collection of glosses which bears the name of Lutatius Placidus, a writer whose *floruit* is generally assigned to the fifth century A. D. ^c The character of this compilation bears a marked resemblance to that of Nonius; Placidus is Nonius in miniature. His work is an extremely meagre compendium of grammar, lexicography, and antiquities, intended to cover much the same ground as the *De Compendiosa Doctrina*. The glosses of Placidus are usually spoken of as intended only for Plautus, and their title confirms this idea. The fact, however, is far otherwise, it being clear that though there are many notes in Placidus which refer exclusively to Plautine words, there are many which are meant for other authors.

It has been supposed that Placidus, like Nonius, took his notes from commentaries. This theory is, I venture to think, as erroneous in the one case as in the other. If the glosses of Placidus be compared with corresponding notes in Festus, Gellius, Nonius, Servius, Macrobius, and Isidore, a large mass of material is brought to light common to all these writers, which it is nearly impossible to suppose they can have derived from commentaries, and not rather from handbooks of lexicography and grammar. Confining ourselves on the present occasion to a comparison between Placidus and Festus or Paulus, we find that a large proportion of the glosses in Placidus must have come, directly or indirectly, from Verrius Flaccus. Some of these have escaped the eye of Deuerling, the most recent editor of Placidus. If I am not wrong in my reckoning, more than a third of the glosses in Placidus correspond closely with notes in Paulus or Festus. The general resemblance between the glosses of Placidus and those in Paulus is, indeed, so great, that

Müller imagined that Placidus borrowed from a version of Festus fuller than the abridgment by Paulus. In rejecting this hypothesis, as they are probably right in doing, Deuerling and Loewe seem to me to go too far when they refuse to admit an organic connection of some kind between Placidus and Verrius Flaccus. There may be no relation of dependence traceable between Placidus and Festus, but this does not prove that a great number of the lexicographical notes in Placidus may not have been derived from a handbook or handbooks compiled from the *De Verborum Significatu*. Of the glosses in Placidus which cannot be paralleled in Paulus or Festus, there are many to be found in Nonius, Macrobius, Servius, and Isidore, but in such a form as to preclude the idea of any one of these writers having copied from any other, Macrobius or Servius from Nonius, or Isidore from either; a fact which surely shows that the sources from which all these writers drew were ultimately the same as the authorities followed by Nonius, in all probability that is, the scholars of the first and the first half of the second centuries A. D.

The value of the glosses of Placidus is not in any way diminished because their origin may in many cases be conjectured. On the contrary, it is clear that being quite independent of Festus, they often preserve remains of notes and sometimes even of passages from ancient authors which have disappeared from the existing epitomes of Verrius.

I now come to the question which originally led me to undertake this tedious investigation. It may, I think, be shown by a minute comparison of parallel passages that several of the notes on Vergil in Macrobius are ultimately derived from Verrius Flaccus. If I am right, an interesting fact will have been clearly elicited which has hitherto been only imperfectly recognized, that Verrius, by embodying Vergilian instances in his articles, was one of the earliest scholars who contributed anything to the interpretation of Vergil.

Readers of Macrobius do not need to be reminded that he shows, or at least professes, an acquaintance both with Verrius Flaccus and his epitomator Festus, and that there is therefore no antecedent improbability that he may have been indebted to Verrius even where he does not name him. To come, however, to details. Let us examine some of the passages in the third book of Macrobius, where he is dealing with Vergil's use of words relating to religious ceremonies. The first that I will take is *porriciam* (III, 2). In illustration of this word Macrobius quotes the antiquarian Fabius

Pictor. Verrius Flaccus commented on this word and illustrated it from Plautus (Festus p. 318 and 319). In support of his remarks on the word *religiosus* Macrobius distinctly appeals to Festus. Passing on to his note on *delubrum* we are met by a curious circumstance. Macrobius (III, 4, 3) has one note, Paulus p. 73 has another on this word. But the substance of both notes is combined by Servius on Aen. 2, 225. Paulus says "*delubrum* dicebant fustem delibratum, hoc est decorticatum, quem venerabantur pro deo." Servius not only gives this explanation, but also those quoted in Macrobius from Varro's *Rerum Divinarum*; and much the same comment recurs, with an addition, in Servius on Aen. 4, 56. The impression left is that both Macrobius and Servius were copying from an article in Verrius Flaccus, of which only a short extract has survived in the epitome of Paulus.

In the fourth chapter of Macrobius' sixth book are discussed some instances in which Vergil revived an antique use of Latin words. The first note which I propose to consider is that on *daedala Circe*, § 20. Macrobius says that Vergil, in using the expression *daedala Circe*, was copying the expression of Lucretius *daedala tellus*. Compare now a note in Paulus p. 68, "*daedalam* a varietate rerum artificiorumque dictam esse *apud Lucretium terram*, *apud Ennium Minervam*, *apud Vergilium Circen*, facile est intellegere." Here it is clear that the original note of Verrius Flaccus included the instances of the word given by Macrobius, as well as another or others taken from Ennius.

The word *reboare* is noticed by Macrobius (§ 21) as a Greek word, and Vergil is again justified by the example of Lucretius. Let us endeavor to trace backwards the history of this note, taking first what Servius says on Georgic 3, 323, "*reboant silvaeque et longus Olympus*." "*Est autem Graecum verbum*. Nam *apud Latinos nullum verbum est quod ante o finalem o habeat excepto inchoo*; quod tamen maiores aliter scribebant, aspiratum interponentes duabus vocalibus, et dicebant *inchoo*." Both these notes can be traced back to Verrius Flaccus. On *boare* Paulus p. 30 says "*boare*, id est *clamare*, a Graeco descendit"; under *inchoo* only a fragment of the original note is left. Verrius (Paulus p. 107) is now made to say that *inchoare* is a Greek word derived from *chaos*, the beginning of things; but we know from another source this was not Verrius' real opinion. For Diomedes p. 365 (Keil) assures us that Verrius derived the word from the Latin word *cohū*=*mundus*, and that it was Julius Modestus (the con-

temporary of Verrius) who defended the Graecizing etymology. In this case the original note of Verrius, or at least the gist of it, seems to be preserved by Servius.

In § 23 Macrobius has another gloss, the fortunes of which we are happily able to follow. He remarks that the word *camurus*, which Vergil uses in the third Georgic, ("camuris hirtae sub cornibus aures") is a foreign word, and goes on to say that perhaps the word *camera* is derived from it. The substance of this note is to be found in Servius' comment on the passage, in Nonius p. 30, who quotes the same line of Vergil, and finally in Paulus p. 43, "*camera* et camuri boves, a curvatione, ex Graeco κάμπη descendit."

One more instance, and I have done. Macrobius comments on Vergil's phrase *aurilos lepores*, which he illustrates by a quotation from Afranius, "aurito parente" = "asino." Paulus p. 8 says that *auritus* is derived "a magnis auribus, ut sunt asinorum aut leporum." One is tempted to infer that Verrius had a note in which he quoted both the passage from Afranius about a donkey, and that from Vergil about hares.

There are other facts to be noticed with regard to these notes in Macrobius. There are traces in them of alphabetical series; thus, *additus agmen crepito horret tremulus umbraculum; defluo discludo deductus proiectus tempestivus: aethra daedalus reboant; camurus Mulciber petulcus: auritus turicremus velivolus vitisator; arcitenens silvicola; noctivagus nubigenus.*

Again, there are traces in them of arrangement according to authors. The series *agmen crepito horret tremulum* is illustrated from Ennius; *lychnus* and *aethra* from the same author; *daedalus* and *reboant*, *petulcus* and *liquidus*, from Lucretius; *arcitenens* and *silvicola* from Naevius.

Again it should be observed that the authors quoted by Macrobius in illustration or defence of Vergil are all favorites with Verrius Flaccus. So that, all things considered, it appears to me not improbable that Macrobius is here copying, if not from Verrius Flaccus himself, at least from some writer of good authority whose writing embodied matter taken from Verrius Flaccus.

The investigation, the main lines of which I have endeavored to indicate in these two essays, will not be complete until it is extended to Servius, Aelius Donatus, Charisius, Diomedes, Priscian, and Isidore. I have been anxious however to point out the method on which, in my opinion, such an enquiry ought to be based, and (to make my meaning perfectly clear) have subjoined a specimen of an

attempted reconstruction of parts of the first two letters of the *De Verborum Significatu* from notes in writers later than Verrius. To sum up briefly what I have attempted to convey, I would say that it appears to me to be a mistake to try the plan of examining such writers as Gellius, Nonius, Macrobius, and Placidus by themselves, or in pairs. At least, as far as I have yet been able to observe, this proceeding only brings us to an explanation of part of the facts which have to be explained, and leaves the rest in the chaos in which they first presented themselves. The excellent work of Schmidt "*De Nonii auctoribus grammaticis*" is, in my opinion, spoilt by his adoption of the theory that the *De Compensiosa Doctrina* is based mainly upon Gellius and upon isolated commentaries. To suppose that a writer of the evident ignorance and general incapacity which characterize Nonius should have gone upon the plan of making independent selections from ancient commentaries seems to me to be exceedingly unnatural. The titles of his chapters suggest rather that each was taken from a separate work of reference, or a separate section in such work. The mere trouble involved in selecting from commentaries and arranging the selections under such heads as those under which Nonius has arranged his work would be very great, and must surely, if it had been really taken, have led to results very different from those which we have in Nonius.

The hypothesis which I would propose as most likely to explain the perplexing phenomena before us would be this: that during the first and fifth centuries A. D. a number of extracts and *compensia*, of which the book of Festus is one, were made from works of reference compiled in the Augustan age and the first century A. D., such as those of Verrius Flaccus, Hyginus, Fenestella, and Julius Modestus; that the same process was applied to the great grammarians, as Remmius Palaemon, Pliny, and Probus, and to the *Lectiones antiquae* of Caesellius Vindex; that much lexicographical matter was taken from Verrius Flaccus, but was quoted as if the excerptor were consulting the authorities used by Verrius Flaccus; that handbooks of general information on points of grammar and lexicography were composed from these sources, specimens of which have survived in the work of Nonius written in the third century, and that of Placidus written in the fifth. A higher species of the same genus is represented by the *Noctes Atticae* of Aulus Gellius (2d century) and the *Saturnalia* of Macrobius (4th century), which make the pretence of combining profound learning with elegance and literary form.

And I would venture to suggest that the first step to be taken in the process of unearthing the ancient roots of this degenerate growth is to examine the notes which can be shown to be common to Verrius Flaccus, Suetonius, Gellius, Julius Romanus, Nonius, Servius, Donatus, Macrobius, Placidus, and Isidore; and when this is done and the notes of Verrius are eliminated, then to compare the other authors and discover, if possible, under what groups their notes can be arranged, and finally to attempt to find, if possible, the common sources of these groups. At least I know of no other method which seems likely to lead to any fruitful issue.

I subjoin a specimen of the application of this method to Paulus.

Paulus p. 2, *armillum*, vas vinarium in sacris dictum, quod armo, id est umero, deportatur.

Nonius p. 74 *armillum*. Lucilius lib. XXVIII "hinc ad me, hinc ilicet anus Rursum ad armillum." p. 547 *armillum* urceoli genus vinarii. Varro De Vita P. R. lib. I "etiā nunc pocula quae vocant *capulas* et *capides*, quod est poculi genus; item *armillum*, quod est urceoli genus vinarii."

Placidus p. 7 Deuerl. *armillum*, vas vinarium. Unde "anus ad armillum."

I would suggest that the gloss of Verrius Flaccus may be partially reconstructed from those in Nonius, the gloss of Placidus showing that the definition given by Paulus and the instance of "anus ad armillum" originally formed part of the same note.

Paulus p. 2 *apricum* locum, a sole apertum, a Graeco vocabulo *φρίκη* appellamus, quasi *ἀφρίκης*, id est sine horrore, videlicet frigoris, unde etiam putatur et Africa appellari. So Servius Aen. 5, 128, Isidore 14, 9, 34.

Paulus p. 2 *amoena* dicta sunt loca quae ad se amanda adliciant, id est trahant. Isidore 14, 9, 33 *amoena* loca dicta Varro ait eo quod solum amorem praestent, et ad [se] amanda adliciant. Verrius Flaccus quod sine munere sint, nec quicquam in his (iis?) officii, quasi *amunia*: id est, sine fructu: inde etiam nihil praestantes *immunes* dicuntur. Serv. Aen. 5, 734 *amoena* sunt loca solius voluptatis plena, quasi *amunia*, unde nullus fructus exsoluitur; unde etiam nihil praestantes *immunes* dicuntur. 6, 638 quasi *amunia*, hoc est sine fructu, ut Varro et Carminius docent.

Here we have distinct evidence that the original note of Verrius included (and indeed defended) an etymology of which Paulus has made no mention.

Paulus p. 4 *armentum* id genus pecoris appellatur quod est

idoneum ad opus armorum. Invenies tamen feminine *armentas* apud Ennium positum. Nonius p. 190 *armenta* genere neutro plerique. Feminino Ennius, "ad *armentas* ipsius easdem." Pacuvius, "Tu cornifrontes pascere armentas soles."

Paulus p. 9 *antruare* . . . *truant*, moventur. *Truam* quoque vocant *quo permovent coquentes exta*. Nonius p. 19 *truam* veteres a terendo, quam nos deminutive *trullam* dicimus, appellari voluerunt. Pomponius Pannuceatis; "mulier ubi aspexit tam magnifice tutulatam truam"; Titinius Setina, . . . "*cocus magnum ahenum*, quando fervit, paula *confutat* trua." Here I should suppose that the words of Paulus' explanation were suggested by the passage in Titinius, which Festus had preserved.

Paulus p. 19 *Aventinus* mons intra urbem dictus est, quod ibi *rex Albanorum Aventinus* bello fuerit *extinctus atque sepultus*. Servius Aen. 7, 657 *Aventinus* mons urbis Romae est, quem constat ab avibus esse nominatum, quae de Tiberi ascendentes illic sedebant, ut in octavo legimus "Dirarum nidis domus opportuna volucrum." Quidam etiam rex Aboriginum Aventinus nomine illic *occisus et sepultus est*, sicut etiam *Albanorum rex* Aventinus, cui successit Procas. Varro tamen dicit in Gente Populi Romani "Sabino a Romulo susceptos istum accepisse montem quem ab Avente fluvio provinciae suae appellaverunt Aventinum." There is a note on this word in Varro L-L 5, 43, of which the comment in Servius is quite independent: I infer from this fact and from the similarity of language between Servius and Paulus, that Servius has preserved a note of Verrius Flaccus.

I quote these instances as specimens of a line of investigation which I hope may be worked out by scholars who have more leisure for the task than I have. About a third of the whole number of glosses given under the first and second letters in Paulus may, I think, be thus supplemented, or at least paralleled, from later writers; a fact sufficient to prove to what a large extent the work of Verrius, in its original form or in excerpts and abridgments, was consulted in antiquity.

HENRY NETTLESHIP.